

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] on the outstanding job that he has done with a difficult bill.

This amendment highlights the problems that he has had with this bill. There are conflicting interests, all of which are necessary and vital. We pit NASA against housing; housing against veterans' benefits. There is no one in this Chamber that wants to cut any of these things unless it is absolutely necessary. And it is absolutely necessary to cut these to get to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

The gentleman's amendment is well intentioned, but it still cuts \$89.5 million out of NASA, and \$235 million out of the National Science Foundation. These cuts are proposed in an effort to help the veterans' programs which now currently, in this bill, receive \$562 million in medical benefits over and above what we spent last year. That represents a total of \$16.777 billion in medical care for veterans.

Mr. Chairman, nobody can say that that is not sufficient. We can always spend more money on these programs, but I would hope that the Members would understand that we cannot continue to spend more money on every good cause. We have got to try to balance the competing interests.

Mr. Chairman, this is a balanced bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the members of the Committee on Appropriations have tried to bring forward a balanced bill considering all of the needs: The needs of the veterans, the needs of science, the needs of NASA, and the needs of housing. Together, those needs demand that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while I respect the words that have been said by my colleagues and respect the work that has gone into making this bill, I still think that this is a question of priorities, and the priorities that I have remain with the veterans in this country.

When we are looking at limited funds, we do have to say, "What is important? How much should we spend on veterans? How much should we spend on science?"

Science is a theoretical number. Should we spend \$100 billion on those science programs? Should we spend \$200 billion? We have no idea what that number should be. It is some number floating out there.

We do know, Mr. Chairman, that veterans have those needs and we do know that we are not meeting those needs currently. To not increase this number up to what the President has requested, I think, would be doing a disservice to the veterans who have paid such a dear price in serving our country. That is why I have offered this amendment, because of the sacrifice that those veterans have made.

It is a question of priorities. There is no question.

Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult decision to make, and I appreciate what the subcommittee chairman and all the members of the committee have gone through in crafting this bill. To me, though, this happens to be a question of priorities. I believe that the NSF can take a 10-percent cut in this year's budget. It is just a question of the priorities that I have set for myself to come and represent the people of southern Nevada and especially those 114,000 veterans that I represent there.

I believe they deserve the medical care that they are to get this year. I would be the first one, though, to add my voice to reforming the whole veterans' medical care. It needs to be reformed just like Medicare does. We need to provide better service for less cost, and then maybe next year, we will not have this argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 27, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] will be postponed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WALKER] having assumed the chair, Mr. COMBEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 2099) making appropriations, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 205 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 205

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the

bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of the rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. An amendment striking section 8021 and 8024 of the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor yet another very fair and simple open rule. H. Res. 205 provides for one hour of general debate, equally divided between the majority and the minority. Following that, any Member can offer amendments in accordance with the rules of the House.

Members are encouraged, but not required, to preprint their amendments in the RECORD, so that we can engage in full and well-informed debate, and I think that is something that has actually worked out pretty well.

In addition, the committee granted limited waivers for the consideration of H.R. 2126, including waivers of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI regarding unauthorized appropriations and reappropriation within this bill.

The need for these protections, due to lack of the authorization for many of the programs, has been thoroughly debated, so I will not debate it here. We all know we have a problem between the authorizing and the appropriations cycle and that is part of the budget reform that we hope to bring forward.

In order to expedite the floor schedule and allow the House to complete its schedule appropriations work before the August break, which I think is of great interest to every Member and

probably the Nation at large as well, the committee granted waivers of clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXII, regarding 3-day layovers for the committee report.

The report for H.R. 2126 has been available since Friday, however, and Members have had the weekend and then some time today to review this report. I would also point out that we have been through much of this in the authorizing process already as well.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the last waiver granted is a technical one for section 306 of the Budget Act regarding measures under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget reported by other committee. I would like to point out to Members that the two "offending" sections of the bill, 8021 and 8024, have been removed at request of the Committee on the Budget by a self-executing amendment, so I think that problem is behind us.

Mr. Speaker, that may seem like a lot of explanation for what really is, in essence, a very simple open rule, but I am confident that we have a very fair, I would say very open rule that will allow us to fully consider this vital appropriations measure.

Providing for our national defense is one of the few charges specifically given to the Congress of the United States under the Constitution and we cannot shirk our responsibilities in this area. Freedom is not free. The

American people demand a strong and ready force, capable of dealing with whatever crisis may arise, wherever it may happen, whenever it may happen.

We obviously must ensure that our armed services are the best trained, best equipped, best provided for, both for their benefit and ours. There are a few, I suppose, who still argue that the demise of the Soviet Union meant an end of all major threats to the United States' interests, therefore, we do not need much defense.

Mr. Speaker, those folks are wrong, in my view, and I think in most Americans' views. Vigorous military buildups in countries like Iran, North Korea, and China pose new challenges to American interests across the globe, not to mention the real threat we face from the slow but steady spread of nuclear capability to new countries and, possibly, to terrorist groups.

□ 1830

Nor could we totally ignore genocide as we now witness it in former Yugoslavia. Threats to democracy and our national security come in many forms, in many ways these days.

No, to most of us there is no question that we need a strong and ready defense, and I am pleased that after several years of steadily declining budgets and uncertain leadership from the administration these past 2 years, we now have a Department of Defense appro-

priation bill that begins to meet the needs both long term and immediate of our armed forces.

Make no mistake, many of the items funded in this bill are not for future acquisition of some high-tech weapons systems, but they are for things like food, clothing and other basic necessities for our men and women in the service.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security Appropriations, my friend and distinguished colleague from Florida, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], presented the Committee on Rules with a list of these basic requirements that were not being met until now. That list, containing lots of nuts and bolts necessary to keep our forces fit, was put on a roll that stretched almost across the entire width of the Committee on Rules hearing room. We may even get to see that roll again before this debate is over.

So I congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and the rest of the Committee on Appropriations for their very hard work on this particularly important appropriations bill.

I urge support for the rule and support for H.R. 2126.

I include for the RECORD the following information:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 31, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open <sup>2</sup> .....	46	44	40	73
Modified Closed <sup>3</sup> .....	49	47	13	23
Closed <sup>4</sup> .....	9	9	2	4
Totals: .....	104	100	55	100

<sup>1</sup> This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

<sup>2</sup> An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

<sup>3</sup> A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

<sup>4</sup> A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 31, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95)
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95)
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95)
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95)
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95)
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95)
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95)
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95)
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95)
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95)
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95)
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95)
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO		Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956		A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	PQ: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: voice vote (4/6/95)

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 31, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PO: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PO: 225-191 A: 233-183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MillCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-196 A: 236-191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PO: 221-178 A: 217-175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95)
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PO: 258-170 A: 271-152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PO: 236-194 A: 234-192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PO: 235-193 D: 192-238 (7/12/95)
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PO: 230-194 A: 229-195 (7/13/95)
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PO: 242-185 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-192 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95)
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PO: 217-202 (7/21/95)
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95)
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: 230-189 (7/27/95)
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PO-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule providing for the consideration of the Department of Defense appropriation for fiscal year 1996. While I am concerned that once again the Committee on Rules did not seek fit to allow the amendment authored by the gentlelady from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], the rule otherwise will allow the House to consider amendments that will amend funding levels contained in the bill.

The Schroeder amendment, of course, seeks to reduce the overall funding level of the appropriation to the level originally sought by the administration. Mr. Speaker, while I personally would not support the Schroeder amendment, I do believe her amendment would have provided the House the opportunity to debate how many Federal dollars should be allocated to the Department of Defense in the coming and future fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2126 closely tracks the provisions of the authorization bill adopted by the House in June. While the two bills are not identical, the appropriation does provide funding for advance procurement of two additional B-2 Stealth bombers. The committee is to be commended for this action and I support the inclusion of these advance procurement funds. I also commend the committee for including \$200 million in the bill for the continued development of the F-22 fighter.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my 17 years in Congress always been a supporter of a strong national defense. I intend to continue my record and support this rule and this appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from greater metropolitan Sandimas-Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. I would like to congratulate both my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], who have worked long and hard on this extraordinarily important piece of legislation.

This is an open rule. It is an amendment process which will allow Members to work their will on a wide range of issues that are going to be coming before us.

It is very important to note, as we embark on the defense appropriation bill, that this is legislation that we are addressing as we are all very concerned about the budget and the deficit and the national debt, and yet it seems to me that as we look at the preamble of the U.S. Constitution, it is very important for us to recognize that providing for the common defense is paramount.

There are a wide range of levels of government, State and local governments, county governments that can deal with many of the issues that the U.S. Government today addresses, and yet when it comes to the security of the United States of America, only one level of government, only one level of government is in a position to address those, and that is the U.S. Government.

So it is for that reason that we have to recognize the preeminence of the issue of defense appropriations.

Now, there are going to be some controversial questions that will come forward. The B-2 bomber is one which I know my very good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], and I have worked on for a number of years. Let me just say this very briefly about that issue, it seems to me if we look at this question and try to back off, it will be the first time in the history of our republic that we would have taken a retrograde step on a new and very important technology.

There are many who argue that since we have seen the demise of the Soviet Union, that it is no longer necessary, and yet there are potential conflicts in the Middle East which a friend of mine in California was talking to me about not too long ago, and other spots where this technology is very important, and it cannot be ignored.

I have to say that none of the jobs for this are actually in my district. I recognize that many of them are in California, but I believe this very firmly, because of the national security of our country, that what we should proceed with the B-2. I hope very much we will be successful when that comes up on the floor.

Let me say that I do congratulate again my friend, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, for the valiant effort he has put forward, the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTONE], and others who have been very involved.

I urge a "yes" vote on this open rule. Then we will look forward to having the House work its will.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. First I compliment my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking Democrat, for their excellent work as well as the full committee.

I also wish to express my appreciation and agreement with the funding for the two long-lead issues involving the B-2.

Of course, Whiteman Air Force Base is in the district that I am privileged to serve, but it is more than that. As the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] so eloquently pointed out, we must look to the future. We must look to future technology. This is the one weapons system that will allow us to

continue to bring the technology forward as we bring the troops and become more continental-based in our Air Force, Army, and Navy. This is what is called power projection. It not only can serve as a strong weapon, it can serve as an excellent deterrent to those who would cause mischief on the other side of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous world in which we live. Few Americans remember even last year that we came within a gnat's eyelash, not once, not twice, but three times to conflict; once involving Haiti, once involving North Korea, and the third time when we sent our troops over and successfully stopped Saddam Hussein from proceeding to the south of the border.

This dangerous world in which we live, and we being the only superpower on this Earth, it is incumbent upon us to be strong, to be militarily prepared. We should learn from history. We should learn that in the years past and the decades past, the United States of America, after every major conflict or every major threat, has cut itself militarily to the bone.

It is my intention to fight hard to keep that from happening now, and I am pleased to see so many Members of this House joining in that fight.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I offered a defense budget of my very own, increasing the administration's budget over 4 years by some \$44 billion. The budget that was adopted came relatively close to that. But we should make sure it is not just in the areas of technology, such as the B-2, not just in the areas of weapons systems, ships and tanks, and guns, but we must look to taking care of the young men and young women who wear the American uniform. That is utmost. That is important in this bill, and I will vote for this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Services.

This bill that will come before us provides funding for the Pentagon. What better bill to give the President a line item veto than the defense appropriations bill?

I have been a supporter since arriving here of the line item veto concept. You can debate and argue as to which particular approach is best, whether to have a pure veto by the President on a line item within one bill or whether, as the other body has proposed, to separate the bills into many different bills with separate enrollments, and have the President veto each separate bill, or whether, rather than vetoing the bill, to enhance the President's rescission authority so that he can strike out items, send them back here for us to vote on, whether we want to include or exclude that particular line item from the spending package.

While we can argue the constitutionality, while we can argue which is the best approach, I believe that it is critical that we give the President the opportunity to speak out, to include in the process his authority of line iteming each particular area that he feels ought to be cut.

I have proposed amendments on each of the last five appropriation bills to do that. They are not in order without a waiver. I acknowledge that. I commend the Committee on Rules for the openness of the bill which they have put forward.

I do wish, however, that we could waive the point of order to allow the provisions of line item veto to be placed on this one bill rather than amending and changing the process for every bill coming forward. If we could apply it to this one bill, have a test case, I believe it is important. I would urge this body to act.

We have yet to even appoint conferees on line item veto. It is important that we move forward.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just simply would like to say that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has made a very important point about our concern about the line item veto, and I would like to have included, among the extraneous material that we are putting in the RECORD today, a statement from the Speaker of the House to the chairman of the Committee on Rules which says, from the Speaker, that he is committed to moving forward on line item veto and to that end he has promised to schedule a motion to go to conference on the line item veto and to appoint conferees press on the first day of House business in September. So we have achieved getting his attention and commitment to getting forward with that, and I will put that in the RECORD at this point.

We have a fair and open rule that allows Members to offer cutting amendments on an appropriations bill, and it is an honor to bring this appropriations bill to the floor with this good a rule on this important subject.

The letter referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 27, 1995

Hon. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR JERRY: I want to thank you for your valuable contributions and ongoing efforts to move the Line-Item Veto Act to conference at the earliest practicable date.

The line-item veto is one of the most important commitments we made as a party in our Contract with America. I have every confidence that with your help and leadership we can resolve the vast differences that exist between the House and Senate passed bills over how best to fashion and implement the line-item veto authority for the President.

Although some have suggested we should delay the process of working out the dif-

ferences with the Senate, I want you to know I am committed to moving forward on this bill. To that end, you have my promise to schedule the motion to go to conference on the line-item veto and to appoint conferees on the first day of House business in September. You can be assured that I share your dedication to enacting this central component of our Contract with America.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.) The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Cardin	Edwards
Ackerman	Castle	Ehlers
Allard	Chabot	Ehrlich
Andrews	Chambliss	Emerson
Archer	Chapman	Engel
Armey	Chenoweth	English
Bachus	Christensen	Ensign
Baesler	Chrysler	Eshoo
Baker (CA)	Clay	Evans
Baker (LA)	Clayton	Everett
Baldacci	Clement	Ewing
Ballenger	Clinger	Farr
Barcia	Clyburn	Fattah
Barr	Coble	Fawell
Barrett (NE)	Coleman	Fazio
Barrett (WI)	Collins (GA)	Fields (LA)
Bartlett	Collins (IL)	Fields (TX)
Barton	Collins (MI)	Filner
Bass	Combest	Flanagan
Bateman	Condit	Foglietta
Beilenson	Conyers	Foley
Bentsen	Cooley	Forbes
Bereuter	Costello	Fowler
Berman	Cox	Fox
Bevill	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Bilbray	Cramer	Franks (NJ)
Bilirakis	Crane	Frelinghuysen
Bishop	Crapo	Frisa
Bliley	Cremins	Frost
Blute	Cubin	Funderburk
Boehlert	Cunningham	Furse
Boehner	Danner	Gallegly
Bonilla	Davis	Ganske
Bonior	de la Garza	Gejdenson
Bono	Deal	Gekas
Borski	DeFazio	Gephardt
Boucher	DeLauro	Geran
Brewster	DeLay	Gibbons
Browder	Dellums	Gilchrest
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Gillmor
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Gilman
Brown (OH)	Dickey	Gonzalez
Brownback	Dicks	Goodlatte
Bryant (TN)	Dingell	Goodling
Bryant (TX)	Dixon	Gordon
Bunn	Doggett	Goss
Bunning	Dooley	Graham
Burr	Doolittle	Greenwood
Burton	Dornan	Gunderson
Buyer	Doyle	Gutierrez
Callahan	Dreier	Gutknecht
Calvert	Duncan	Hall (TX)
Camp	Dunn	Hamilton
Canady	Durbin	Hancock

Hansen	McHale	Saxton
Harman	McHugh	Scarborough
Hastert	McInnis	Schaefer
Hastings (FL)	McIntosh	Schiff
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Schroeder
Hayes	McKinney	Schumer
Hayworth	McNulty	Scott
Hefley	Meehan	Seastrand
Hefner	Meek	Sensenbrenner
Heineman	Menendez	Serrano
Herger	Metcalfe	Shadegg
Hilleary	Mfume	Shaw
Hilliard	Mica	Shays
Hinchee	Miller (CA)	Shuster
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Sisisky
Hoekstra	Mineta	Skaggs
Holden	Minge	Skeen
Horn	Mink	Skelton
Hostettler	Molinari	Slaughter
Houghton	Montgomery	Smith (MI)
Hunter	Moorhead	Smith (NJ)
Hutchinson	Moran	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Morella	Smith (WA)
Inglis	Murtha	Solomon
Istook	Myers	Souder
Jackson-Lee	Myrick	Spence
Jacobs	Nadler	Spratt
Johnson (CT)	Neal	Stearns
Johnson (SD)	Nethercutt	Stenholm
Johnson, E. B.	Neumann	Stokes
Johnston	Ney	Studds
Jones	Norwood	Stump
Kanjorski	Nussle	Stupak
Kaptur	Oberstar	Talent
Kasich	Olver	Tanner
Kelly	Ortiz	Tate
Kennedy (MA)	Orton	Tauzin
Kennedy (RI)	Owens	Taylor (MS)
Kennelly	Oxley	Taylor (NC)
Kildee	Packard	Tejeda
Kim	Pallone	Thomas
King	Parker	Thompson
Kingston	Pastor	Thornberry
Kleczka	Paxon	Thornton
Klink	Payne (NJ)	Tiahrt
Klug	Payne (VA)	Torkildsen
Knollenberg	Peterson (FL)	Torres
Kolbe	Peterson (MN)	Torricelli
LaFalce	Petri	Towns
LaHood	Pickett	Trafficant
Lantos	Pombo	Upton
Largent	Pomeroy	Velázquez
Latham	Porter	Vento
LaTourette	Portman	Visclosky
Laughlin	Poshard	Vucanovich
Leach	Pryce	Waldholtz
Levin	Quillen	Walker
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Walsh
Lewis (GA)	Radanovich	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Rahall	Ward
Lightfoot	Ramstad	Waters
Lincoln	Rangel	Watt (NC)
Linder	Reed	Watts (OK)
Lipinski	Regula	Waxman
Livingston	Richardson	Weldon (FL)
LoBiondo	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
Lofgren	Rivers	Weller
Longley	Roberts	White
Lucas	Roemer	Whitfield
Luther	Rogers	Wicker
Maloney	Rohrabacher	Williams
Manton	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson
Manzullo	Rose	Wise
Markey	Roth	Wolf
Martinez	Roukema	Woolsey
Martini	Roybal-Allard	Wyden
Mascara	Royce	Wynn
Matsui	Rush	Yates
McCarthy	Sabo	Young (FL)
McCollum	Salmon	Zeliff
McCrary	Sanders	Zimmer
McDade	Sanford	
McDermott	Sawyer	

## NAYS—1

Franks (CT)

## NOT VOTING—24

Becerra	Jefferson	Pelosi
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Flake	Lazio	Stark
Ford (TN)	Lowe	Stockman
Green	Meyers	Thurman
Hall (OH)	Moakley	Tucker
Hoke	Mollohan	Volkmer
Hoyer	Obey	Young (AK)

## □ 1902

Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to House Resolution 201 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2099.

## □ 1904

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, title V was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title V?

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN:  
Amendment No. 71: Page 88, after line 3, add "Sec. 519. None of the funds under this Act shall be used for the Senior Environmental Employment Program."

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding we were going to vote on the two previous amendments, the Durbin-Dingell and one other, and then go to amendments on VA-HUD. Could the membership be informed as to what the plan is? I understand there needs to be some time to count votes and things; that is fine. But just what is the specific plan?

The CHAIRMAN. The plan is, as the Chair announced, to consider amendments to title V that were earlier not offered because Members were not present, and at the point that those amendments have been voted upon,

then consider all of the remaining amendments to the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. So, just to continue my parliamentary inquiry, does this mean all votes, including the Durbin-Wilson-Dingell and Ensign amendments, and votes on additional amendments, will be rolled until the end of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That may happen. The Chair cannot totally restrict the offering of amendments after that block of votes in that title V of the bill would still be open for amendment until the Committee rises. The Chair could not restrict Members from having the authority to offer those amendments.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I am not asking if Members will be restricted in offering amendments. I am simply asking when we can expect the next block of votes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was simply trying to state that following the amendments that would be offered now, they will be taken in order, the three the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] mentioned plus others that may be offered on which votes are called.

Mr. SCHUMER. Just extending my inquiry, Mr. Chairman, does that mean, if, say, there is a vote on the amendment being offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] which will be debated very soon, will we vote on that immediately after the debate on that amendment, or will that be pushed to the back like these amendments, the Durbin-Wilson-Dingell and Ensign amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. If requested, a roll-call vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] would come at the end of the three which have already been postponed, and the further amendments would then come in order as well.

Mr. SCHUMER. So in other words, Mr. Chairman, it would be fair to say that we are going to roll all votes until we finish debating all the amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be fair to state that that is correct.

The Chair would make this exception:

If after the series of votes taken on all amendments on which votes have been requested, if there were amendments which were in order that were offered, then the Chair would obviously recognize those.

So the Chair is only stating there could possibly be amendments offered after the votes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Understood, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a cost-saving measure that would be on page 88 at the very end of the bill. It would simply say that in creating a new section 509 that none of the funds under this act shall be used for the Senior Environmental Employment